

Comment on “Quantum identification schemes with entanglements”

Wim van Dam*

UC Berkeley, MSRI, HP Labs Palo Alto

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

In a recent paper, [Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052326 (2002)], Mihara presented several cryptographic protocols that were claimed to be quantum mechanical in nature. In this comment it is pointed out that these protocols can be described in purely classical terms. Hence, the security of these schemes does not rely on the usage of entanglement or any other quantum mechanical property.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Dd

Keywords: quantum cryptography, classical cryptography, entanglement

The cryptographic protocols presented in [1] use entangled quantum states and are called “quantum password schemes”, “quantum identification schemes” and “quantum message authentication schemes”, thus suggesting that the security of these procedures relies on the properties typical of quantum information. In this Comment we will show that this suggestion is incorrect as these protocols can be described in purely classical terms. More specifically, the protocols in [1] only use the classical correlations between the bits of the distributed quantum states. All procedures are, in fact, only variations of the traditional *Vernam cipher* scheme, which has been known since the early 1900s [2].

The two-party “quantum password” scheme of [1] uses n copies of the bipartite, entangled state $|\psi_i\rangle := (|0, 0\rangle + |1, 1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The password is an n -bit string $p \in \{0, 1\}^n$, and the goal of the scheme is to let one party (the system) verify that the other party (the user) knows p , under the requirement that this verification does not make p public. This is achieved by the following steps. First, the system selects a random n -bit string $r \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Second, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, if $r_i \neq p_i$ then the system applies the classical NOT operation,

$$X := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

to its bit of the entangled state $|\psi_i\rangle$. If $r_i = p_i$, then the $|\psi_i\rangle$ remains unchanged. Simultaneously, the sender applies X to her part of $|\psi_i\rangle$ for all i with $p_i = 1$, while she does not change the states $|\psi_i\rangle$ for which $p_i = 0$. (As a result, the states $|\psi_i\rangle$ have changed to $(|r_i \oplus p_i, p_i\rangle + |1 \oplus r_i \oplus p_i, 1 \oplus p_i\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$.) Third, the user measures her parts of the entangled states in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and sends these outcomes $u_1, \dots, u_n$ to the system. The system measures his part of the entangled states in the computational basis as well, yielding the bits $s_1, \dots, s_n$.

Finally, the password is verified by the system who checks the identity $r_i = s_i \oplus u_i$ for all i .

First of all, it should be noted that the usage of the random bits r_i in the above protocol is unnecessary. The scheme works equally well if the system chooses r to be the string $0 \dots 0$. More important, though, is the fact that the same scheme can also be implemented when the parties substitute the entangled states $|\psi_i\rangle$ with classically correlated states $\rho_i := \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|)$. Because the protocol uses only the classical NOT operation and measurements in the computational basis, it is easily verified that this substitution gives a completely classical process that does not differ from the just described procedure. This shows that the security of the “quantum password” scheme does not rely on the quantum mechanical properties of the entangled states $|\psi_i\rangle$, but rather on the classical, shared randomness that these states exhibit.

In similar vein, one can recast the “multipartite quantum password” scheme of [1] into a classical procedure that uses classically correlated multipartite states. The essential ingredients of the scheme in [1] are: m -qubit states $|\phi\rangle := (|0, \dots, 0\rangle + |1, \dots, 1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, the *Hadamard transform*

$$H := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

the phase changing operation

$$Z := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and measurements in the computational basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. To see that this scheme is equivalent with a classical procedure, it is helpful to consider it in the *Hadamard basis* with $|\hat{0}\rangle := H|0\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\hat{1}\rangle := H|1\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Note that the phase changing Z operation equals the classical NOT operation X in this basis: $H^\dagger \cdot Z \cdot H = X$, which allows us to use the notation $\hat{X} = Z$. Furthermore, we have for the initial entangled state,

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{m-1}}} \sum_{y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus y_m = 0} |\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_m\rangle,$$

which is a uniform superposition of all bit-strings $y \in \{0, 1\}^m$ with even parity. In this alternative basis, the multipartite password scheme of [1]

*Electronic address: vandam@cs.berkeley.edu; Computer Science Department, University of California, Soda Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720-1776, USA. Also at Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, Berkeley, and HP Labs, Palo Alto. This work was made possible by an HP-MSRI postdoctoral fellowship.

can be expressed as a protocol that uses the state $(\sum_{\oplus y=0} |\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_m\rangle)/\sqrt{2^{m-1}}$, the NOT transform $\hat{X}$ (with $\hat{X} : |\hat{0}\rangle \mapsto |\hat{1}\rangle$ and $\hat{X} : |\hat{1}\rangle \mapsto |\hat{0}\rangle$), and measurements in the basis $\{|\hat{0}\rangle, |\hat{1}\rangle\}$ (which equal the combination of the Hadamard transform, followed by a standard measurement, which is used in the article). As with the two-partite password scheme, we see by this limited set of operations that the protocol relies only on the classical correlations between the bits, only now it uses the Hadamard basis instead of the computational basis. As a result, we can again replace the entangled states $|\psi\rangle$ by classically correlated states

$$\rho := \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \sum_{y_1 \oplus \dots \oplus y_m = 0} |\hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_m\rangle \langle \hat{y}_1, \dots, \hat{y}_m|,$$

without changing the cryptographic properties of the password scheme.

The “identification” and “authentication schemes” that are described in [1] use states and operations that are identical to the ones of the password scheme discussed above. Consequently, all of them can be re-expressed with classical correlated states, and none of them thus

qualify to be called “quantum schemes”.

In 1919, Gilbert Vernam patented[2] the one-time pad encryption protocol where two parties use a shared, secret, random string $r_1, \dots, r_n$ to transmit a secret message $m_1, \dots, m_n$ by broadcasting publicly the scrambled string $m_1 \oplus r_1, \dots, m_n \oplus r_n$. Thirty years later, Claude Shannon proved the security of this Vernam cipher in a mathematical rigorous way [3]. The recent article [1] by Mihara described, essentially, this same classical procedure. Both procedures require the parties to securely share correlated information—classical bits in the case of the Vernam cipher and, seemingly, quantum bits for the implementation of Mihara’s protocol. It is true that the cited procedure of Lo and Chau [4] gives an unconditionally secure way of distributing these correlations between the separated parties and it also true that this task does not seem to be possible classically. But it would be incorrect to infer from this that the protocol of Mihara itself is quantum mechanical as well. Rather, one has to conclude that it is only the distribution of correlations that requires the use of quantum mechanics, but not the usage of these correlations as described in Mihara’s article.

-
- [1] T. Mihara, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052326 (2002)
[2] G.S.Vernam, “Secret signaling system”, U.S. Patent # 1,310,719 (1919). See also, A.J.Menezes, P.C.van Oorschot, and S.A.Vanstone, *Handbook of Applied Cryptography*, CRC Press, Boca Raton (1997)

- [3] C.E. Shannon, Bell system Technical Journal **28**, pp. 657–715 (1949)
[4] H.-K.Lo and H.F.Chau, Science **283**, pp. 2050–2056 (1999)